

Tesnau, Tab

From: Patrick Oberth [Pat.Oberth@vexortechnology.com]
Sent: Friday, March 08, 2013 3:33 PM
To: Tesnau, Tab
Subject: Re: a couple questions about the letter

Will respond Monday.

Patrick Oberth
Facility/Technical & Compliance Manager
VEXOR Technology Inc.
330-721-9773. Office
330-242-1169. Cell

On Mar 8, 2013, at 2:59 PM, "Tesnau, Tab" <Tesnau.Tab@epa.gov> wrote:

I have a few questions on the 3-6-13 incoming letter to EPA. Maybe we should discuss these first.

1. Did you get a letter from ReCommunity saying that the VEF that they send you is the non-waste product described in the August 24 letter (<http://www.epa.gov/osw/nonhaz/define/pdfs/ReCommunityLetterAugust24.pdf>)?
2. I was of the understanding that we could focus a response on the VEF made from ReCommunity's ReEngineered Feedstock (blended with the industrial wastes and processed). The March 6 letter to me references "Engineered Fuel Feedstock."
3. This is an example of contaminant removal that was previously described, please concur if we can still use it

"For example, a batch of feedstock is assessed and a material is found that is not acceptable (e.g., a brake pad), it is mechanically separated from the rest using a track hoe and removed by an operator."

4. The March 6 letter says that materials that enhance combustion are added. Are the examples we previously discussed still appropriate "For example carbon black and oils are added, if needed, to increase the heating value. Absorbents are also added, if needed, at this stage or earlier in the process. The absorbents used include paper, cardboard, diaper tailings, and sawdust."

Someone else wanted to know if these fuel amendments and absorbents are virgin/non-waste materials. I was thinking that they are secondary materials. Is that correct? Should we list more materials as the fuel amendments or absorbents?

5. Please confirm that the testing is on a composite sample of the process batch as we previously discussed.

Tab Tesnau

703-605-0636